



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,300	02/27/2004	Padakandla Krishna Rao	51085-3 /slb	8776
7380	7590	07/27/2007		
SMART & BIGGAR P.O. BOX 2999, STATION D 900-55 METCALFE STREET OTTAWA, ON K1P5Y6 CANADA			EXAMINER PORTIS, SHANTELL L	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/27/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/787,300	RAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shantell Portis	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/27/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/14/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-6, filed May 4, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Heubel et al. have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Noel et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. **Claims 1, 12, 21, 22 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Consider **claims 1, 12, 21, 22 and 23**, the phrase "walkie-talkie like" renders the claims indefinite because the addition of the word "like" to an otherwise definite expression (e.g., walkie-talkie user device) extends the scope of the expression so as to render it indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2617

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3 and 5-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Noel et al. (Noel), U.S. Publication No. 2005/0032539.

Regarding Claims 1, 12 and 21-24, Noel discloses a method, a user device, a network, a system and a memory of messaging during an active half-duplex session between a plurality of user devices capable of walkie-talkie-like functionality **(PTT calls use a half-duplex communications system and therefore, only one person can have the ability to speak at a time; [0004])**, the method, the user device, the network, a system and a memory comprising: a first user device **(requestor of mobile device)** of said plurality of user devices **(participants of mobile devices)** while in a receiving in half-duplex (RHD) mode for an active half-duplex session **(the call begins when the call originator presses the appropriate button, e.g., a PTT button, on a wireless phone and begins speaking)**, transmitting a transmit channel request message (TCRM) to a network **(130)** **(as the call progresses, a participant may want to speak while another participant is currently speaking. The participant wanting to speak sends a request (TCRM) to speak)**; the network **(130)** forwarding the TCRM **(if the call participant initiating the request has a higher priority level than that of the current speaker, a message is sent to each mobile device)** to a second user device **(current speaker of mobile device)** of said plurality of user devices **(participants of mobile devices)** while the second user device is in a

transmitting in half-duplex (THD) mode for the active half-duplex session (**the current speaker ability to speak is terminated**); and the second user device (**current speaker of mobile device**) receiving the TCRM (if the call participant initiating the request has a higher priority level than that of the current speaker, a message is sent to each mobile device). See paragraphs [0019]-[0022].

Regarding Claims 2 and 13, Noel discloses wherein each user device of the plurality of user devices is a wireless device (**the mobile device 110 is shown in Figure 1 as a wireless phone; [0019]**).

Regarding Claims 3 and 12, Noel discloses further comprising the first user device locally receiving a request to transmit the TCRM (**the participant wanting to speak sends a request to speak by making the proper selection. This typically accomplished using the push to talk button on mobile device; [0022]**).

Regarding Claims 5, 15, 16, 19, 21 and 24, Noel discloses further comprising including an identification of the first user device in the TCRM at least when the TCRM is forwarded to the second user device (**after the participants for the call, call group, are selected, their identities and priority level are transmitted to the PTT server 140 for storage. This information is compared and used by the PTT server for determining if the requestor can be granted the ability to speak; [0021] and [0022]**).

Regarding Claims 6 and 12, Noel discloses further comprising: the second user device in response to receiving the TCRM generating a user-detectable notification indicating the second user device has received the TCRM (**when the change of**

speaker message is sent, the current speaker loses the ability to transmit her speech; [0022]).

Regarding Claims 7 and 15, Noel discloses further comprising: the second user device generating user-detectable notification indicative of the identification of the first user device **(see rejections for claims 5 and 6).**

Regarding Claim 8, Noel discloses further comprising: the network, upon receiving the TCRM from the first user device, determining a talk group the first user device is participating in, determining another user device in the talk group that is in THD mode, which another user device is said second user device **(see rejection for claim 1).**

Regarding Claims 9, 17 and 19, Noel discloses further comprising including a qualifier flag **(priority level)** in the TCRM at least when the TCRM is forwarded to the second user device **[0021] and [0022].**

Regarding Claims 10, 17 and 19, Noel discloses further comprising performing extended functionality in response to a value of the qualifier flag **(if the priority level is a higher priority than that of the current speaker then a message is sent to each mobile device indicating a change in speaker is set to occur. The requestor is granted the ability to speak; [0022]).**

Regarding Claims 11, 18 and 20, Noel discloses wherein the extended functionality comprises at least one functionality selected from the group consisting of: a) registering a continuing transmit channel request at the THD device; b) canceling a transmit channel request at the THD device; and c) performing automatic release of the

transmit channel by the THD device (if the priority level is a higher priority than that of the current speaker then a message is sent to each mobile device indicating a change in speaker is set to occur. The requestor is granted the ability to speak; [0022]).

Regarding Claim 14, Noel discloses wherein the active half-duplex session is a push-to-talk.TM (the mobile device has a push to talk button) half-duplex voice communication session [0004] and [0022].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noel in view of Stubbs, U.S. Patent No. 6,930,994.

Regarding Claim 4, Noel discloses wherein the half-duplex session is a voice communication session as described above.

Noel fails to specifically disclose wherein the half-duplex session is a voice communication session compliant with at least one system selected from the group of IDEN.TM., 1XRTT CDMA, GSM/GPRS, UMTS, and TDMA.

In a similar field of endeavor, Stubbs discloses a dynamic allocation of radio resources in a packet switched communications system. Stubbs further discloses wherein the half-duplex session is a voice communication session compliant with at

Art Unit: 2617

least one system selected from the group of iDEN.TM., 1XRTT CDMA, GSM/GPRS, UMTS, and TDMA (**Abstract**).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide a half-duplex video conferencing call between two parties or in a dispatch mode between groups of call participants wherein operable in both a GPRS virtual connection mode and a conventional circuit-switched mode (Stubbs-Col. 12, lines 20-23 and lines 32-38) for further allowing efficient and organized queuing of call participants (Noel).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Metais et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,136,663 discloses a method for controlling a communications channel shared by several stations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantell Portis whose telephone number is 571-272-0886. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am-3:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


SLP


LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER